



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Vm

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,466	09/27/2001	Tsutomu Tamaki	030675-063	9568

7590 12/05/2003

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

LEE, BENNY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2817	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
		EXAMINER
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		DATE MAILED:
Patent Office is responsible for the examination of your application. DO NOT ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO EXAMINER OR ATTORNEY.		

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 16 Sept 2003 This action is made final

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
 Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
 Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.

Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
 Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- 1-17

1. Claims _____ are pending in the application.
 Of the above, claims 3-14 are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1, 2, 15-17 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims 1-17 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has both received not been received
 been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other _____

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2817

Claims 3-14 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 8.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Note that explicit detail descriptions of Fig. 8B should be respectively provided (e.g. including reference labels L1, L2, etc). Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ulian et al.

Ulian et al (Figs. 3a, 3b) disclose top and bottom substrates (30, 32), each of which comprises a circular region therein characterized as a “waveguide terminal” (especially when the region is arranged in conjunction with strip conductors (34, 36, 38) to define a waveguiding structure). Note that a “contact region” (i.e. 44, 44') is associated with the respective substrate and surrounds the corresponding circular region and electrically grounds a portion of the circular regions. An interconnect or “joint” member comprising solder points (60; 62₁, 62₂, ...) are

Art Unit: 2817

arranged to “bond” or join together the substrates (30, 32) across the opposing contact regions by being sandwiched therebetween to thereby form to form a unitary connected structure.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulian et al. Ulian et al discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, in which the substrates (30, 32) are “bonded” to each other by soldering at solder points (60; 62₁, 62₂, ...), but does not disclose bonding of the substrates by conductive adhesive or thermocompression bonding.

Note that in figs. 2a, 2b, an alternative connecting joint member (50) is provided. Accordingly, in view of this alternative structure, obviously one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that such a structure would needed to have been bonded to substrates (30, 32) to provide a secured unitary structure. Therefore, in using such an embodiment as an alternative to the solder point arrangement, this would have suggested that any equivalent type of bonding (e.g. adhesive, thermal compression, etc) would have been usable therewith.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 15-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 963466

Page 4

Art Unit: 2817

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benny Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308 4902.



BENNY T. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2817

B. Lee

November 26, 2003